

### Seattle Parks and Recreation Department

Kenneth R. Bounds, Superintendent

## Project Review Committee South Lake Union Park Development

Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2005

Committee Members:				Absent
Ken Bounds	Parks, Superintendent	ken.bounds@seattle.gov	684-8022	
Erin Devoto	Parks, Dir. PDD	erin.devoto@seattle.gov	233-7937	
Aaron Bert	DOF	aaron.bert@seattle.gov	684-5176	X
Phyllis Lamphere	SPF	lampherepl@aol.com	748-7355	
John Nesholm	SPF	jnesholm@LMNArchitects.com	682-3460	
Sharon Coleman	Vulcan	sharonc@vulcan.com		
Alex Bennett		abennett@gbsre.com		X
Staff:				
Karen Daubert	SPF, Exec. Dir	karen@seattleparksfoundation.org	332-9900	
Kimberly Bowen	SPF, Dvlp. Dir	kimberly@seattleparksfoundation.org	332-9900	
Toby Ressler	Parks, PM	toby.ressler@seattle.gov	615-1482	
Michael Shiosaki	Parks, PPL Mngr	michael.shiosaki@seattle.gov	615-0823	
Victoria Schoenburg	Parks, SA	victoria.schoenburg@seattle.gov	684-7031	
Kristen Eyman	Parks, Admin.	kristen.eyman@seattle.gov	684-7161	
Guests:				
Nick Dunaske	Hargreaves	ndunaske@hargreaves.com	415-865-	
			1811	
Betsy Davis	CWB	betsy@cwb.org	382-2628	
Lyn Tangen	Vulcan		342-2447	

Superintendent Ken Bounds called the meeting to order at 10:38 AM

# 1. Review Roles & Responsibility of the Committee and select a chair of the Committee: Ken reviewed the roles, responsibilities and members of the committee per the recent ordinance. The committee decided to meet monthly to review project progress and resolve any issues. The committee motioned and seconded Ken Bounds as the Chair of the Project Review Committee.

#### 2. Update project schedule and budget:

Ken Bounds gave a brief summary of the history of the bulkhead and project schedule and budget. Current design includes replacement of bulkhead but is approximately \$3.4 M over funding availability. Previous option was a product of the value engineering process and to meet budget, had to reduce the length of the west side bulkhead and take 27' of existing park land at the north bulkhead. Reduction of existing park land was not an acceptable option to the Seattle Foundation or Seattle Parks. Current design is the design submitted to DPD and

regulatory agencies. In continuing with the current design, there are issues with the schedule due to the recent determination by DPD regarding the need for a land use code change needed for the bridge. It appears that the bridge can not be permitted until council approves and then approval from DNR is received.

Toby outlined the current options:

*Option 1 Original Design:* Reduce park land on north and reduce length of bulkhead on west. Hargraves designed the west bulkhead outside of existing bulkhead which does not comply with land use codes and would need to be moved to the inside of the existing wall. Design includes the bridge. To do so will add costs, so at this point this option is not within current funding available. If funding is available, construction can begin after revised drawings and revised permits are resubmitted and approved. This could potentially begin in the summer of 2006.

*Option 2 Replace Bulkhead Walls:* The new walls would be six feet inland of the old walls. The old walls would be removed in winter 2006. This option includes all desired elements (deep water moorage, bulkhead replacement, terraces, boardwalk, and bridge) but is \$3.0-3.4 million over available funding. If funding is available, construction can begin in 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2006.

*Option 3 Reinforce existing bulkhead walls:* Reinforce the existing walls by adding additional support in the water (rip-rap) and behind the existing wall. The north wall can be trimmed down to accommodate the terraces. This affords additional protection of the existing walls and would allow for boardwalk and terraces to be installed. The lifespan of the original wall is estimated to be 50 to 55 years and is currently about 40 years old. Estimated life span of the wall is 5-15 years; this option may increase lifespan by 10-15 years. This option is estimated to be within budget.

Hargreaves, (Nick) could design the bridge and walkway to be good for the 15 years left on the life of the bulkhead and then design a new bulkhead later that would accommodate the bridge and walkway. If this option is selected construction can begin after revised drawings and revised permits are resubmitted and approved. This could potentially begin in the summer of 2006.

1. *Option 4 Replace the north wall only:* Replace north wall in '06, build bridge in '06 and replace west wall at a future date. This option would not require a substantial change to the drawings already submitted but would require extra funds for site prep and all permits would need to be resubmitted. Keeping the existing west wall will require supporting the boardwalk on piles along both edges of the structure. The terraces will be supported by the new wall at the north edge and steel pipe piles at the south edge. Replacing the existing west wall in the future: By constructing the new features (timber terraces and boardwalk) several feet offset (inland) from the existing wall, the space left between the existing wall and new construction may accommodate a new wall behind the existing wall. Joint connection between the existing west wall and new north wall will require additional detailing and costs which have not been worked out. Removing the hog fuel along the north only may jeopardize the integrity of the west wall. Further, the new back fill will have to be carefully designed to ensure that the loads on the west wall are no

greater than the loads imposed by the hog fuel. Generally, many unknowns due to joining new construction to old. Detailing and calculations will take a long time. Early estimates show this to be approximately \$1.5M over available funding.

John Neshhom asked whether or not just the cap could be repaired or replaced. It is the part that is failing due to exposure to water and air. Nick said that Hargreaves would look into it. Nick from Hargreaves responded that Hargreaves could review this option.....but if the cap is repaired then the lifespan of the existing bulkhead walls was still only 10 - 15 years.

#### 3. Scope & funding options:

A fifth option would be to look at reinforcing the existing wall only. John Nesholm stated that the foundation did not want to raise additional funds and therefore the options over budget would not be feasible.

John felt that the ideal option is to find the funding for Option 2.

Discussion also took place regarding replacing the west bulkhead wall and leaving the north bulkhead wall for completion at a later date..

#### 4. Action items for next meeting:

To summarize; John and Phyliss asked Ken to return to the city to request the additional funding to fully replace the bulkhead walls.

Ken agreed to do so and get back to the group.

#### 5. Schedule future meetings:

The group decided to meet the following week on Wednesday, November 16, from 3:30 to 5:00 at the Officers Club at the Armory.

Post Meeting- this has been delayed until the week of December 12th.

#### 6. Adjournment

Documents provided:

Agenda
Copy of Ordinances 121963 & 121902
Site Plan
Cost Estimate for complete bulkhead replacement
SLU draft project budget
Project Options